DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 898 SO 030 583

AUTHOR Harris, Ian M.; Glowinski, Jessica; Perleberg, Nancy .
TITLE Factors That Promote Implementation of Peace Education Training. Peace Education Miniprints No. 94.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
ISSN ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE 1998-08-00
NOTE 26p.
AVAILABLE FROM Lund University, Malmo School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45, Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict Resolution; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Global Education; Higher Education; *International Relations; *Peace; Prosocial Behavior; *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed 31 professional educators who have taken a peace education course to see what factors influence their use of skills and knowledge acquired in this class. The main hypothesis of this study is that theoretical knowledge is not enough to motivate teachers to become peace educators. Respondents indicated that knowledge of subject matter was important but not as important as feelings of urgency about violence. Religious faith, past peace education success, and school climate helped peace education efforts. Responses to a questionnaire used in this study indicate the wide variety of approaches to peace education: (1) 58% were dealing with diversity; (2) 54% were teaching about peace; (3) 50% were helping their students cope with violence; (4) 35% were advocating violence prevention; and (5) 23% were working with a peer mediation program. Contains 7 tables and 31 references. (Author/LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 429 898

Peace Education Miniprints
No. 94
August 1998

FACTORS THAT PROMOTE IMPLEMENTATION OF PEACE EDUCATION TRAINING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Ian M. Harris
Jessica Glowinski
Nancy Perleberg

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Bjerstedt
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SO 030 583

FACTORS THAT PROMOTE IMPLEMENTATION OF PEACE EDUCATION TRAINING

Ian M. Harris
Jessica Glowinski
Nancy Perleberg

This study will survey 31 professional educators who have taken a course *Peace Education* to see what factors influence their use of skills and knowledge acquired in this class. The main hypothesis of this study is that theoretical knowledge is not enough to motivate teachers to become peace educators. Respondents indicated that knowledge of subject matter was important but not as important as feelings of urgency about violence. They also indicated that religious faith, past peace education success and school climate supported their peace education efforts. Responses to the questionnaire used in this study indicate the wide variety of different approaches to peace education taken by teachers. 58% were dealing with diversity; 54% were teaching about peace; 50% were helping their students cope with violence; 35% were advocating violence prevention; while only 23% were working with a peer mediation program.

Factors that Promote Implementation of Peace Education Training

Ian M. Harris
Jessica Glowinski
Nancy Perleberg

Peace Studies Program
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
P.O. Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201, USA

"The responsibility for building a peaceful and enlightened society rests chiefly with the educator." (Krishnamurti, 1953/1981, p. 94)

In response to a world that seems to be growing increasingly violent, peace education programs have found their way into primary, secondary, and tertiary educational institutions. These programs start in a variety of different ways. Some begin because some high ranking bureaucrat in a school institution commands that his/her staff implement reforms based upon peace principles. Others start from the grass roots with teachers working together to implement peace education programs at their schools. For others, the impetus for peace education comes from outside the school, from professional organizations and community groups concerned about high levels of violence, who want the schools to take a proactive stand in relation to violence both at school and in the broader community (Harris, 1988). A key question in the development of these programs is, "How do educators learn about peace education?"

For 15 years the principle author of this article, Dr. Ian Harris, has taught a course, *Peace Education*, that trains teachers to teach about and for peace. Some of the educators who take this course go on to incorporate material they have learned into their professional activities.

Others don't. The question this paper will address is: What factors influence whether or not teachers trained in peace education actually teach about peace? The answer to this question should help others become more effective in training teachers to apply peace education concepts and techniques to their schools.

The approach taken to peace education in this class is a broad one. It involves getting the adult students to express their concerns about violence in their lives, presenting an analysis of different peace strategies, and arguing that teaching about alternatives to violence is an effective way to deal with the threats of violence both in schools and in the broader community. This peace education course is offered as part of a Peace Studies Certificate Program at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. The objectives of the course are to explore the role of violence in the lives of students, to consider the effect of violence upon educational practices, to examine how peace education can help deal with violence, and to provide examples of peace education activities and curricular ideas. Classes are held in a seminar format with the texts providing background information. The instructor poses questions to the class which lead to interactive discussions. Students are also provided with a comprehensive bibliography of both books and videos addressing issues related to:

conflict resolution	peace
domestic violence	peace education
environment	racism
nonviolence	solutions
nuclear weapons	war and problems of violence

Peace curricula are available for review by students. As a final paper each student prepares a peace education curriculum that can be used when the course is over.

Not all the students who take this course are working in educational settings or preparing themselves for teaching careers. One hundred sixty students have taken this course since it was first offered in 1983. The majority are adult community educators who work in a wide variety of nonprofit agencies in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. They are racially diverse. Students in schools and colleges other than education are attracted to this course because of its weekend format and because it is part of the

Peace Studies Certificate Program. Forty-three percent of the students who take this course actually work in formal education settings. Less than one sixth of the 160 students who have completed this course are graduate students, many of whom are school personnel working on a masters degree in Cultural Foundations of Education. These teachers are attracted to the course because of high levels of violence they are experiencing at school and in the lives of the students they teach. Recent studies show that 20% of American middle and high schools reported at least one serious crime in 1997 (Burns, 1998). According to the U.S. Center for Health Statistics, 7,000 children die violently in the United States each year (Marchione, 1998). More than 3 million crimes occur each year in schools. A variety of students, most of whom work in human service institutions in the public sector, take this course because they are concerned about high levels of violence in this Midwest city.

This follow-up study was conducted in the fall of 1997 in an urban area where schools are twice as likely to report serious violent crime as those in suburbs or rural areas. This research study consists of a questionnaire distributed to the graduates of this course who are working in schools. Data from this questionnaire will help answer the question about why some of these practitioners are using peace education techniques in their professional lives. The main hypothesis of this study is that theoretical knowledge about violence and nonviolence is not enough to motivate teachers to become peace educators. They need further support, either in their personal or professional lives, to pick up this new curricular area. Data from this questionnaire will explain what kinds of support are available to teachers to help them implement peace education, will provide insight into contemporary peace education practices, and will explain benefits of peace education training.

Literature Review

There has not been much research on what factors influence people going through an inservice or a class in peace education to actually use that material at some time in the future. The most comprehensive discussion of a peace education program and its impact upon teachers comes in

Waging Peace in Our Schools (Lantieri & Patti, 1996). In this book, the authors discuss the impact of the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) in New York City, that trained teachers in various aspects of peace education, most specifically social emotional literacy, bias awareness, and conflict resolution. In a recently completed study about the effectiveness of RCCP training, Roderick (1998) reported that 20% of the teachers who receive the training actually use it in their classrooms. Lantieri and Patti say that coaching and practice are key components in whether or not teachers used the peace education material in which they received training:

> Every teacher in New York City who has attended an RCCP introductory training receives five to ten visits to their classroom from a staff developer, an educator who has deeply integrated the principles of our work into his or her personal and professional life. Beyond their expertise in teaching RCCP concepts, staff developers receive extensive training in coaching strategies and conferencing techniques, so that they can ascertain what will be helpful to the classroom teacher and provide the needed one-on-one support. (p. 131)

The peace education class at the University in Wisconsin-Milwaukee did not provide any follow-up coaching. It was a "normal" university class, and the professor made no effort to visit teachers who had taken this class to mentor their development as peace educators.

Lantieri and Patti (1996) state that district-wide support has been a key ingredient in the success of the RCCP program:

> Ideally, RCCP is implemented at the district level so as to insure an eventual shift in institutionalizing this innovation over a period of time in the school district. We start by collaborating with the superintendent, talking about what the needs of the school district are and how RCCP can help meet those needs. When a school district makes a commitment to implement RCCP, it makes a long-term commitment (four to five years) to the program. (p. 219)

The majority of teachers who participated in this study have been teaching in the Milwaukee public schools. With 100,000 students, this is the 22nd largest school district in the United States. This large urban school district has made a commitment to peace education through a board resolution passed in 1985 mandating peace education (Haessley, 1991). However, the

follow through on this mandate has been sporadic. In a large district other priorities have overwhelmed this commitment to peace education, and changes in superintendents have meant that the board mandate has not received strong support (Harris, 1996a).

Lantieri and Patti (1996) go on to say that peace education should not just be an add on used by a few teachers, but rather should involve all levels of the school. This finding has also been mentioned in other literature dealing with school responses to violence. In fact it has a name, "the peaceable schools project" (Crawford & Bodine, 1996). Under the aegis of such a program the attempt is made to train all staff in the school from the principal to the janitor in peace education, so that it is adopted in the whole school. From this literature it can be deduced that those teachers who received peace education training who find themselves in schools with a strong commitment to peace education principles would be most likely to adopt the principles of peace education in their classes. Although there are several schools within the Milwaukee area that are dedicated to peace education, none of the participants in this study work in those schools. They can more accurately be classified as teaching (or working as aides or guidance counselors or administrators) in traditional schools that don't have a specific mission that endorses peace education. Even though these individuals might be interested in implementing peace education, they find themselves pretty much on their own in schools that do not have a strong stated commitment to peace education.

Some studies that evaluate the impact of peace education courses provide insight into what effect this course might have upon students. Eckhardt (1984) found that after peace education training, college students have a change in their attitudes towards peace and away from violence. Other studies have demonstrated cognitive changes as a result of peace education efforts (Feltman, 1986; French, 1984; Lyou, 1987). Harris (1992) has shown that college students most often are most interested in changing their own behavior after such instruction, rather than trying to work on external circumstances that cause violence.

Several studies not specifically focusing on peace education provide insight into factors that may influence a teacher's adoption of material presented at an in-service workshop or class. A number of studies have reported teacher training as an important factor influencing how and

whether teachers implement a given curriculum (Basen-Enquist et al., 1994; Ojanen, 1993). A supportive administration exerts a positive effect on how educators use a new program by helping to locate and provide additional resources, to answer questions about the intent of the program, to help with scheduling problems, and to act as advocates to school district administration. Organization size is a constantly positive predictor for the availability, but not necessarily the implementation of new programs. Positive factors for smaller districts include reduced bureaucracies. If teachers have support staff (e.g., school health personnel) available and supportive administrations, they are more likely to use new curricula (Smith, McCormick, Steckler, & McLeroy, 1993).

Michael Fullan (1992) provides a list of factors contributing to and inhibiting implementation of new curricula. These include:

Facilitators	Obstacles
System commitment and preoccupation with curriculum	Teacher capacity, overload
Director's commitment	Principal's lack of leadership
Widely understood, sound and practical procedures	Lack of financial resources
Leadership at central level	Additional demands
Increased leadership by principals	Complexity of the model
Open climate, high expectations, high recognition	Role of school board and turnover
Healthy curriculum budget	
Selective use of external agencies	
Persistence and cumulative development	

Further factors influencing implementation included specific characteristics of the program, school-based factors and community support.

In an article entitled "Integrating Curriculum Implementation and Staff Development," Scott (1994) delineates several factors which influence curriculum change. First is whether the administration is supportive of the changes or if financial and peer support are present. Second is what level of input the faculty has regarding the changes or if it was

merely dictated to them. Third is whether the teachers felt isolated, had inadequate resources or had the opportunity to make only little impact on the total system. Inger (1991) notices a lack of funds for peace education initiatives. Much training in peace education comes from outside consultants and is limited. As a result educators are not trained in conflict resolution as extensively as they are in subject areas, so that they may feel insecure about pursuing it in their classes.

Other researchers (Araujo, Batista, & Lau, 1992; Bernthal, 1995) have noticed differences between long-term and short-term effects of training. Training in a particular area tends to have long term effects, if the training solves concrete problems. Thus, if the participants in this study find that peace education provides immediate benefits, they are more likely to incorporate into their educational practices.

To summarize, there are many factors which influence an educator's incentive to develop and/or implement a new curriculum. Strongly influential is the perceived support of administration, including time and financial support to familiarize educators with the program and to purchase appropriate materials. A supportive environment with positive feedback and peer collaboration is also important, as well as an ability to have input to attain a sense of ownership. An important obstacle to teachers taking up any new training comes from demands on their time.

Methodology

The questionnaire used in this study consists of 60 items. The first three items ask the respondent to indicate whether he or she is working in a school, and, if so, at what level. The next 13 items provide information about the respondents' experiences with peace education. The next 29 items focus on factors that promote use of peace education. Graduates of this class were asked, "Does your school currently have a peace studies program?" Respondents were asked to rate on a six point scale (on a six point scale going from 0 to 5, 0 = unsupportive, 5 = supportive) how supportive the following factors from their school community have been for their use of peace education—faculty, administration, neighborhood, students, curriculum, support staff, resources, and role models. Anything

below "3" is rated as unsupportive and any factors above "3" will be considered supportive. Respondents were also asked to rate on the same scale how supportive the following factors have been—knowledge of subject matter, feelings of urgency, religious faith, students' parents' involvement, in-service training, available funds, past successes with peace education, and school climate. The next 11 items asked them to rate Dr. Harris's class. The next six items asked them to indicate what benefits they had received from taking this class. They were then asked to indicate how supportive the following have been of their use of peace education —family, friends, neighbors, peers, work companions, significant others, children, and students. Finally, they were given three open-ended stems: "What improvements have you seen as a result of your use of peace education?" "What problems have been created as a result of your use of peace education?" "Please use this space to indicate anything else you would like to add about peace education."

During the fall of 1997 a research team was established to carry out this study. This team consisted of five students who were taking the *Peace Education* class. It was thought that students could better conduct this research, because graduates of the class might be eager to impress the professor with what they had accomplished and hence give inflated answers. This team with the advice of Professor Harris developed the questionnaire, field tested it on other students in the class who were working in area schools, mailed out the questionnaire, conducted follow-up phone interviews, and wrote up the results in draft form. Dr. Harris has completed the final version of this paper with the help of two students who are listed as co-authors.

Questionnaires were mailed to 68 people whom Dr. Harris thought were still working in schools. Twenty-five respondents returned the questionnaire by mail, 20 of whom were working in schools. Follow-up phone interviews by members of the research team raised the response rate to 31, 26 of whom were working in schools. This represents a 45% return rate from the original pool. Data used in this study come from the 26 respondents who were working in schools. The responses were anonymous. They were coded, so that follow-up phone calls could be made to those who volunteered to participate further in the study.

Results

Of these 26 respondents only 12 worked within the Milwaukee public school system that has a mandate endorsing peace education. The others worked in suburban schools, where they are promoting peace education on their own without the support of school board endorsement. Only 38% of the respondents had a peace education program in their school. Fifty-two percent thought they would have one in the future. Fifty-five percent of the respondents are teachers. Others are counselors (19%) and aides (7%). Four percent are administrators, and 15% fit the category "others."

Half of the respondents had taken the peace education class in the previous 8 years. Eight (32%) had taken a peace education workshop or seminar prior to taking this class. Only one had taken a peace education class prior to taking this class at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Therefore, for the vast majority of respondents, this class was their first formal introduction to peace education. Three people have taken a further class on peace education, while 12% have taken workshops or seminars on peace education since completing the class.

The peace education class has impacted upon the work of these respondents. Ninety-six percent are currently using peace education techniques in their educational practice. Eighty-four percent said they have tried to educate others about peace since taking the peace education course. At the time of taking the class only 64% expected to become peace educators. This means that 8 of the 25 respondents were influenced sufficiently by the course to incorporate some of the principles of peace education in their work.

As a result of the class 65% viewed themselves as successful peace educators. Eighty-five percent would recommend the class to other educators. Sixty-seven percent felt that they were properly prepared to teach peace education after this class, while 52 % indicated they would have liked to have further coaching on these issues.

Respondents indicated the following benefits to taking a peace education class:

Table 1
BENEFITS FROM TAKING A PEACE EDUCATION CLASS

"more aware of issues that cause conflict"
"I have met interesting and dynamic people."
"provided a center for organizing curriculum"
"try to mediate rather than dictate"
"clear sense of mission"
"better defined values"
"appreciation of the importance of holistic teaching"
"dealing with stress and violence better"
"reduction of negative attitudes"
"enjoy being peaceful, not violent"
"response of children"
"understanding children/grandchildren better"
"helped you realize you can help others"
"I see a broader picture now; less petty and selfish as a person"
"I have a better sense of racism from the witness of other class participants."
"contributed to upcoming career change in pastoral ministry"
"I have changed how I talk to others with more concern about how my behaviors influence them or theirs affects mine. I have encouraged others to examine how their feelings are influencing behaviors."

In addition to the benefits cited in Table 1 other respondents indicated that their commitment to peace education had positive effects upon school-wide climate and a reduction in discipline problems in schools. Another respondent indicated, "better understanding of anger and more control of it; better listening skills; feel less threatened; better, renewed personal relationships." Several responded after this class that their problem solving and anger management skills had improved. Many indicated increased awareness of issues and increased involvement in both community and school settings

In Table 2 below respondents indicate some of the drawbacks of taking a peace education class:

Table 2
DRAWBACKS FROM TAKING A PEACE EDUCATION CLASS

"feeling that the violent world is too overwhelming and that I can't make a difference."
"anger at being looked at as wimpy or weird, getting less respect."
"seen as naive by some"
"racial issues"
"easy to feel inadequate in face of the task"
"It's difficult and time consuming to work through difficulties with a few students while others wait."
"the pain and lack of common language and agreed upon values in the school system where I work"

These comments reflect the difficulty teachers face in confronting issues of violence. They often are not seen as being tough enough in a culture that supports peace through strength approaches to keeping the peace (Harris, 1996b). Others responded that were teased by their colleagues for their interest in peace ("remember the sixties"). Some said they were seen as naive by other faculty and others were accused of propagandizing their students. The task of working toward peace can be difficult and time consuming, and students can resist a nonviolent approach to conflict resolution. Many teachers reported that barriers to doing this work come from societal ignorance about peace and violent media. Many stated that peaceful relations are not emphasized in the homes of their pupils.

Table 3 below indicates the type of peace education techniques respondents are using in their schools. (These percentages are not cumulative, because respondents could check more than one item.)

In the category "other" were the responses—"using articles about peace when teaching reading strategies to teachers," "staff climate/school wide policies," "students assistance program—conflict resolution," "working in my neighborhood for positive attitudes," "make kids aware of violence," "become involved in finding a solution." Table 3 provides some interesting insights into how educators are using peace education techniques at the end of this century.

Table 3
DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEACE EDUCATION

Technique Used	*Percentage Using It*
Dealing with diversity	58
Teaching about peace	54
Helping students cope with violence	50
Other	35
Advocating violence prevention	35
Working with peer mediation program	23
Teaching emotional literacy	15
Using a peace curriculum	12
Running extra curricular peace activities	4

Table 4 below indicates degree of satisfaction respondents felt with their training in peace education.

It indicates that the educators who took this class have been rewarded for their commitment to peace education in spite of some of the hostile reactions by some of their fellow peers who thought they were being soft by teaching about peace.

Table 4
RESPONSES TO PEACE EDUCATION
PERCENTAGE

Stem	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree
"Peace education is a valuable part of my classroom activities."	30	52	13	4
"Peace education has solved concrete problems in my job."	24	32	36	8
"Peace education has improved me professionally."	42	42	12	4

Table 5 below indicates how supportive various factors in their school community were for peace education on a six point scale going from unsupportive to supportive (0–5):

Table 5
RANK ORDERING OF SCHOOL FACTORS
By means from a 6-point scale (0–5)

Factor	*Ranking*
Administration	3.63
Faculty	3.57
Role models	3.47
Support staff	3.44
Resources	3.11
Students	2.95
Curriculum	2.90
Neighborhood	2.80

These results corroborate the literature on school reform that state that the presence of a supportive administrator is the most important ingredient in whether a particular innovation gets adopted. The types of things administrators can do are provide release time and funding for training. They can also reinforce peaceable school principles in their management style. Teachers responded that there were various community resources—speakers, training programs, and conferences—that reinforced their work as peace educators. From this table it appears that the neighborhood surrounding the school does not support peace education activities. One teacher said she would like to put peaceful resources (videos) into her pupils' homes. These respondents also did not find the traditional curriculum supportive of their efforts to teach about peace. Although these individuals reported they had school support for their efforts to teach about peace, they did not seem to have support from the community.

Table 6 below indicates how supportive personal factors were in the decision of a respondent to implement peace education techniques.

Table 6
RANK ORDERING OF PERSONAL FACTORS

Factor	*Ranking*
Feelings of urgency	4.30
Knowledge of subject matter	3.96
Religious faith	3.75
Past peace education success	3.35
Inservice training	2.43
Students' parents' involvement	2.14

These results show something about the respondents to this questionnaire, that they are highly motivated for personal reasons to become peace educators. They want to help their pupils solve problems related to violence and see they can make a positive contribution by teaching conflict resolution skills. They are also seeking a way to resolve petty problems and fights in schools. They are concerned because they feel their students are angry. Participants in this study indicated that they have a religious faith that motivates them to become peace educators. They did not receive any further inservice training.

Table 7 below indicates how supportive various people have been of respondents' efforts to teach about peace.

This table shows that personal friendships and kinship ties provide support for these individuals to become peace educators.

Table 7
RANK ORDERING OF SUPPORTIVE PEOPLE

Factor	*Ranking*
Children	4.00
Significant others	3.50
Work companions	3.50
Family	3.38
Friends	3.38
Peers	3.30
Neighbors	2.60

On several of the open ended stems respondents indicated that they would have liked further training in peace education. Specifically they would have liked more training in cultural differences, since in these multi-racial schools many conflicts arise because of cultural misunderstandings. One individual indicated he/she would have liked a support group that meets regularly. Another said that he or she would have liked some follow-up seminars:

There is a great need for a follow-up support group and for ongoing continuing education courses in peace education. *One course alone will not begin to make a peace educator.*

One said he or she would like support and mentoring in organizing parents many of whom accept violence as a normal way of life.

Discussion

This research study provides important insights into what benefits professional educators receive from using peace education strategies. It helps explain what they are doing to promote peace in the schools where they work. It does not provide much insight into why people who took

this course, *Peace Education*, are not using peace education techniques in their schools. Attempts were made to call every graduate of the course, but many could not be reached and others choose not to participate in this study. We do not know if 55% of the professional educators who took the course and did not return the questionnaires are using peace education techniques. Ninety-six percent of those who responded were using those techniques. We do not have thorough data from graduates of the course that might shed insight into why educators are not implementing peace education strategies after taking the course. Only one respondent in this study indicted that he/she was not using peace education.

Table 1 indicates many personal benefits graduates of this course have received from this class. They get a positive response from the children they teach and enjoy helping others deal with problems of violence. These comments corroborate an earlier research study conducted by the principle investigator, in which he found that most graduates of peace education classes take the content matter of these subjects and proceed to work directly on issues of violence in their own lives, as opposed to becoming peace activists and attempting to stop violence in the external world (Harris, 1992). Responses tabulated in Table 4 indicate that the graduates of this class are receiving professional benefits from their use of peace education, and, according to the research review, this should result in further use of peace education. The main drawbacks that respondents cited were working in a school culture that prefers get tough responses to conflict, where peace education is seen as too soft. Respondents also indicated that they felt that the problems of violence are so overwhelming that there is little that can be done.

Table 3 provides a very interesting view of how peace education is being implemented in schools in the United States. Most studies seem to imply that the most common form of peace education is peer mediation (Guerra, Tolan, & Hammond, 1994; Noguero, 1995; Smith, 1996). Only 23% of the respondents in this study indicated that they were involved in peer mediation programs, while 35% indicated they were advocating violence prevention, another form of peace education that has received wide scale coverage (Cohen, 1995; Prothrow-Stith, 1991; Toch, Guest, & Guttman, 1993). Participants in this study indicate that their use of peace education is much broader than these two categories and includes dealing

with diversity, a key component of peace education (Lantieri & Patti, 1996, and Prutzman, Stern, Burger, & Bodenhamer, 1988). They are also teaching about peace, and helping students cope with violence. This finding could be a result of an orientation provided by the instructor of this class who believes strongly that peace education should include positive images of peace, and not just negative peace strategies to stop violence (Harris, 1996b). The rationale for this approach to peace education is that young people will be faced with conflict throughout their lives. Classes about peace should provide them with nonviolent alternatives, so that, when faced with conflict, they will choose to act peacefully.

This emphasis upon the positive aspects of peace is reflected in the responses to Table 3 which indicate that graduates of this course are using holistic strategies to deal with the problems of violence. It is interesting to note that only 12% indicated they were using a peace curriculum, although many have been published and are widely available. Responses to Table 3 indicate that the use of peace education in schools may be much more wider than previously reported in studies that indicate that as many as 8,500 schools out of 86,000 schools in the U.S. have peer mediation programs (*The Fourth R*, 1988, p. 2).

Table 5 indicates the positive school factors that promote implementation of peace education training. They are in order—the administration, faculty, role models, support staff, and resources. The importance of supportive school leadership is emphasized in the literature review as well as in several conversations with graduates of this course who wanted to implement peace education strategies in their classes but were despondent about doing so because the school administration did not believe in that approach. This table also provides some indicators of factors that make it hard for peace educators to implement peace education—students raised in a culture of violence, a curriculum that does not mention peace, and a neighborhood rife with conflict.

Respondents indicated in Table 6 that knowledge of subject matter was an important factor in their ability to implement peace education techniques in their schools, which underscores the importance of this kind of in service training for teachers. The main hypothesis of this study was that knowledge of subject matter alone was not enough to stimulate

students in this course to teach about peace. This hypothesis was supported by the greater weight given to feelings of urgency in Table 6. Respondents also indicated the importance of religious faith, past peace education success, and school climate in their decisions to promote peace strategies in their schools.

Teaching about violence and peace can be depressing and demanding. Respondents indicated in Table 7 that personal factors like children, significant others, work companions, family, friends, and peers supported their interest in peace education, while their neighbors did not. In various creative ways these respondents found support for their peace education efforts in their churches, families, schools, and friendship circles for this proactive approach to the problems of violence in the postmodern world. From these responses it can be concluded that knowledge of subject matter is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for peace education curriculum reforms. Professional educators also need personal and professional support for a world view that embraces peace in the midst of a violent culture that glamorizes violence.

Conclusion

It is clear from this survey that professional educators can become more aware of problems of violence by taking a peace education class, but this does not guarantee that they will utilize what they have learned in class. Family support, feelings of urgency, and professional factors like administrative support and positive school climate help teachers deal with the overwhelming nature of this subject matter. It is not the abstract formal content of the class that motivates them to become peace educators but rather their personal experiences related to violence and peace that influence whether or not they will implement peace education techniques. It is hard to be a peacemaker in a violent society. An important question that comes from this study is: How can school leaders provide a climate that supports the use of peace education curricula?

Despite the fact that there are some serious inhibitors to the implementation of peace education programs, at least in the southeastern Wisconsin area, there appear to be more factors which promote their use.

Personal factors appeared to be more influential than school related ones; however, as noted in the hypothesis and literature review, a supportive administration is key to an educator's decision to begin a peace education program. The most important issues appear to be related to the support of people around the educator—colleagues, friends, and family. It is interesting that the feelings of urgency were most crucial among those surveyed. This speaks to the grave need for programs in peace education since many people perceive the world becoming more violent every day.

This study of educators does not by any means provide a full measure of the impact of one course in peace education upon the violent culture of postmodern America. It can be assumed that the students these professional educators reach are also impacted by the subject matter and peaceful orientation of this class, although this study made no attempt to evaluate their students. The impact of peace education upon students is very hard to assess because students could take years to transfer a learning about nonviolence into positive peaceful behaviors. Because of the complex factors that influence human behavior, it is almost impossible to demonstrate that a teacher's activities result in a specific behavior on the part of a student. What this study does show is that teachers feel they benefit from learning about peace strategies and that incorporating peace education reforms has positive benefits for professional educators struggling to deal with problems of violence.

References

Araujo, O., Batista, J., & Lau, A. (1992). *Retraining the European workforce: How technologies can help.* Paper prepared for the European training technology event, Vienna Austria, Nov. 5–7, 1991. ED359320, microfiche.

Basen-Enquist, K., O'Hara-Tompkins, N., Lovato, C., Lewis, M., Parcel, G., & Gingiss, P. (1994). The effect of two types of teacher training on implementation of smart choices: A tobacco prevention curriculum. *Journal of School Health, 64*(8), 334–339.

Bernthal, P. (1995). Evaluation that goes the distance: Links between training and organizational values. *Training and Development, 49*(9), 41–45.

Burns, R. (1998, March 20). 20% of U.S. Schools report serious crime. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, p. 13a.

Cohen, R. (1995). *Students resolving conflict*. Glenville, IL: Good Year Books.

Crawford, D., & Bodine, R. (1996). *Conflict resolution education: A guide to implementing programs in schools, youth serving organizations, and community and juvenile justice settings.* U.S. Department of Education: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Eckhardt, W. (1984). Peace studies and attitude change: A value theory of peace studies. *Peace and Change, 4*(1), 79–85.

Feltman, R. (1986). Change in peace attitude: A controlled attitude change study of internationalism. *Peace Research, 18*(1), 66–71.

The Fourth R. (1998, March). P. 2.

French, P. (1984, September). Preventive medicine for nuclear war. *Psychology Today*, p. 70.

Fullan, M. (1992). *Successful school improvement.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Guerra, N., Tolan, P., & Hammond, W. (1994). Prevention and treatment of adolescent violence. In L. Eron, J. Gentry, & P. Schlegel (Eds.), *Reason to hope: A psychological perspective on violence and youth* (pp. 383-404). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Haessley, J. (1991). Peace education in Milwaukee. *Peace in Action, 5*(1), 36–39.

Harris, I. (1988). *Peace education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

Harris, I. (1992). The challenge of peace education: Do our efforts make a difference? *Educational Foundations, 6*(4), 75–98.

Harris, I. (1996a). Peace education in an urban school district in the United States. *Peabody Journal of Education, 71*(3), 63–83.

Harris, I. (1996b). From world citizen to peace in the 'hood: Peace education in a postmodern world. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 2*(4), 378–395.

Inger, M. (1991, June). *Conflict resolution programs in schools*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC/CUE Digest Number 74.) ED338791, microfiche.

Krishnamurti, J. (1953/1981). *Education and the significance of life*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Lantieri, L., & Patti, J. (1996). *Waging peace in our schools*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Lyou, J. K. (1987). Studying nuclear weapons: The effect on students. *Peace Research, 19*(1), 11–18.

Marchione, M. (1998, March 28). TV violence desensitizes children, expert says. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, p. 3b.

Noguero, P. (1995). Preventing and producing violence: A critical analysis of responses to school violence. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(2), 189–212.

Ojanen, S. (1993). *Follow-up studies and adult education*. A paper presented a the International Conference on Teacher Education, Tel-Aviv, Israel, June 1993. ED398200, microfiche.

Prothrow-Stith, D. (1991). *Deadly consequences*. New York: Harper Collins.

Prutzman, P., Stern, L., Burger, M. L., & Bodenhamer, G. (1988). *Friendly classroom for a small planet: Children's creative response to conflict*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Roderick, T. (1998). Evaluating the Resolving Conflict Creatively program. *The Fourth R, 83*, 3–5.

Scott, F. (1994). Integrating curriculum implementation and staff

development. *The Clearing House, 67*(3), 157–160.

Smith, D., McCormick, L., Steckler, A., & McLeroy, K. (1993). Teachers' use of health curricula: Implementation of Growing Healthy, Project SMART, and the teen health teaching modules. *Journal of School Health, 63*(8), 349–354.

Smith, M. (1996). Strategies to reduce school violence: The New Mexico Center for Dispute Resolution. In A. Hoffman (Ed.), *Schools, violence and society* (pp. 253-264). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Toch, T., Guest, T., & Guttman, M. (1993, November 8). Violence in schools. *U.S. News and World Report.*

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

ISSN 1101-6418